

## REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending. Claims 1-3, 7-13, 16-21, 25-31 and 34-36 are amended herein.

### 102 and 103 Rejections

The instant Office Actions states that Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being either anticipated by or unpatentable over Morley et al. ("Morley;" US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0056081). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully assert that Morley does not show or suggest the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 1-36.

Applicants respectfully note that the instant Office Action admits that 28 of the 36 claims are not disclosed by Morley. Applicants respectfully submit that the fact that such a large portion of the claimed subject matter is not disclosed by Morley is evidence of the nonobviousness of the present claimed invention in light of Morley.

Applicants also respectfully note that claims such as Claims 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 34, 35 and 36 are rejected simply on allegations that the claimed subject matter is "well known." Applicants respectfully disagree with those allegations. Applicants respectfully submit that merely stating that differences between the claimed invention and Morley are well known is not sufficient to establish obviousness without some objective evidence in support. Applicants

respectfully request that a reference or references supporting the allegations be provided.

Applicants respectfully agree with the statements in the instant Office Action that Morley does not disclose “d) writing at least a part of said data into a first data block buffer; e) compressing said part of said data in said first data block buffer into a compressed data block that is written to a second data block buffer; f) encrypting said compressed data block in said second data block buffer into an encrypted and compressed data block that is written to a third data block buffer” as recited in independent Claims 1 and 19.

Applicants also respectfully agree with the statements in the instant Office Action that Morley does not disclose “c) receiving from said source computer system at least one encrypted and compressed data block of said data, said encrypted and compressed data block transferred over said computer network; d) writing said encrypted and compressed data block to a first data block buffer; e) decrypting said encrypted and compressed data block into a compressed data block that is written to a second data block buffer; and f) decompressing said compressed data block in said second data block buffer and writing a resultant data block to a third data block buffer” as recited in independent Claims 11 and 29.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the allegations in the instant Office Action that the limitations cited above are inherent in Morley. Applicants respectfully note that Claims 1 and 19 explicitly recite that the

data is written from one data block buffer to another data block buffer after the data is compressed but before the data is encrypted. Also, Applicants respectfully note that Claims 11 and 29 explicitly recite that the data is written from one data block buffer to another data block buffer after the data is decrypted but before the data is decompressed. Applicants respectfully assert that Morley does not show or suggest these explicitly claimed steps.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that Morley does not show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 11, 19 and 29. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 1, 11, 19 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is traversed and that Claims 1, 11, 19 and 29 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 2-10, 12-18, 20-28 and 30-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is also traversed, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims and recite additional limitations.

### Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-36 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



William A. Zarbis  
Reg. No. 46,120

Date: 7/1/04

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060